

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventors:	Steven Maddocks, et al.	Examiner:	Sherrod L. Keaton
Serial No.:	10/757,762	Group Art Unit:	2175
Filed:	January 14, 2004	Docket No.:	200315423-1
Title:	User Interface for a Storage Network		

REPLY APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.41

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed July 24, 2009, Appellants file this Reply Brief in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.41.

AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT ACCOUNT

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's deposit account no. 08-2025.

Sub-Heading: Claims 1- 4 and 21

Claim 1 recites an automated storage system with a GUI that receives “user input to grant and deny access permissions for hosts to both the data access drives and to the transfer robotics.” The examiner admits that Blumenau and AAPA do not teach this recitation. The examiner, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with Basham at column 4, lines 34-59 and column 8, lines 1-42. Appellants respectfully disagree.

Basham teaches a data storage library that regulates access to shared read/write drives, not both read/write drives and the transfer robotics. In Basham, multiple hosts have access to the same read/write drives (i.e., the hosts share drives). In order to regulate which host can access the drives at one time, a controller prevents a host from removing a cartridge unless this host has access rights. This avoids conflicts when one host is writing to or reading from a cartridge and another host also wants to write to or read from the same cartridge.

Column 4, lines 34-59 in Basham teaches that storage slots in the library are divided into partitions. These partitions are then shared among the hosts. A host cannot access a partition unless the host has access rights to this partition. Nowhere does this section of Basham teach or even suggest that user input can grant and deny access permissions for hosts to both the data access drives and to the transfer robotics. This section of Basham only teaches granting or denying access to storage slots or partitions in the library. In Basham, the user could not grant or deny access of a host to both a drive and the transfer robotics (i.e., the picker). Basham does not suggest such finite control.

Column 8, lines 1-42 in Basham teaches that each host is associated with and given access rights to a partition in the library. The controller stores the mappings between the hosts and partitions (i.e., the controller knows which hosts have access permissions to which partitions). When the controller receives a read/write request from a host, the controller consults the map to determine whether the requesting host has access rights to the requested partition. If the host has such rights, then the controller grants permission and implements to request. If the host does not have such rights, then the controller denies permission (i.e., issues an error message). Nowhere does this section of Basham teach or even suggest that user input can grant and deny access permissions for hosts to both the data access drives and to the transfer robotics. This section of

Basham only teaches granting or denying access to storage slots or partitions in the library. In Basham, the user could not grant or deny access of a host to both a drive and the transfer robotics (i.e., the picker). Basham does not suggest such finite control.

Sub-Heading: Claim 5

In the Examiner Answer, the examiner reiterates that Fig. 14 of Blumenau teaches a logical map of the data access drives and transfer robotics. Appellants respectfully disagree because this figure in combination with the other art teaches a GUI with a general mapping. No suggestion is provided in any of the art, however, that such a mapping would include a level of detail showing both data access drives and transfer robotics.

Sub-Heading: Claim 6

In the Examiner Answer, the examiner argues that that Fig. 14 at 1420 of Blumenau teaches access permissions for the data access drives and transfer robotics in a table format. Appellants respectfully disagree because this figure in combination with the other art teaches a general topology or mapping. No suggestion is provided in any of the art, however, that such a view would show access permissions for the data access drives and transfer robotics in a table format.

Sub-Heading: Claim 7

In the Examiner Answer, the examiner argues that that Blumenau at column 30, lines 6-9 teaches a graphical user interface that receives user input to deny and grant access permissions by selecting one or more of the rows or columns in a window. Appellants respectfully disagree because this section of Blumenau in combination with the other art teaches the general idea of pull down menus. No suggestion is provided in any of the art, however, that these pull down menus would enable user input to deny and grant access permissions by selecting one or more of the rows or columns in a window.

Sub-Heading: Claims 22 and 23

In the Examiner Answer, the examiner argues that that the abstract and Fig. 14 of Blumenau teaches a GUI that identifies the hosts and the data access drives so the user can change the access permissions between the hosts and the data access drives. Appellants respectfully disagree because this section of Blumenau in combination with the other art teaches a GUI wherein the user can see which host has access to which storage volume. No suggestion is provided in any of the art, however, that this GUI would provide a level of detail so a user could change the access permissions between the hosts and the data access drives.

Sub-Heading: Claims 8, 10, 12, 17, 18, and 19

Appellants note that in rejecting these claims, the examiner does not cite Basham, but only Blumenau and AAPA. In the final OA, the examiner admits that Blumenau does not “explicitly disclose receiving user input to grant and deny access permissions for hosts to both the data access drives and to the transfer robotics” (see FOA mailed 07/24/2009 at p. 5). Appellants agree with this admission. This admission supports the position that the examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case that Blumenau in view AAPA teaches recites receiving user input in the application window to change access permissions of hosts to the data access drives and the transfer robotics as recited in claim 8.

Appellants provide further analysis in the original appeal brief to show that AAPA does not teach this claim element.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully ask the BPAI to reverse the rejections of the examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529